

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 remain in the present application. Independent Claims 1, 13, 25, and 34 have been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the newly amended claims and in view of the arguments set forth below.

Specification Objections

Applicants submit that the reference character “312” indicates the encryption unit “EU” and the reference character “381” indicates the “encryption key register” as shown in Figure 3 and described in the specification. Other objections to the specification have been corrected through the above amendments.

35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejections

The above referenced office action states that independent Claims 1, 13, 25, and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Summers et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,133) in view of Hendricks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,927). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The independent claims of the present application have been amended to explicitly recite the generation of a data stream, the encryption of the data stream, and the secure transfer of the data stream across a bus and among components and without exposing an unencrypted data stream (emphasis added). For example, Claim 1 has been amended to explicitly recite:

 a first component for generating a data stream;
 a first encryption unit coupled to the first component, and for
 encrypting the data stream for transmission to generate an encrypted data
 stream;
 a second component for generating a video signal for a display
 device;
 a second encryption unit coupled to the second component and for
 decrypting the encrypted data stream received from the first component;
 a bi-directional digital bus coupled to the first encryption unit and
 the second encryption unit; and
 a third component coupled to the bus for arbitration such that
 content from the data stream is securely transferred across the bus and
without exposing an unencrypted data stream.

This prevents the exposure of the unencrypted data stream for possible
interception by unauthorized users.

In contrast, Summers shows an encryption system for transmitting
encrypted data across a bus, but Summers does not appear to show any special
mechanisms or procedures for preventing exposure of an unencrypted data
stream. Summers contemplates circuit cards in a chassis (Figure 1 of Summers).
Such circuit cards are clearly not secure in the sense that they appear to take no
precaution to avoid exposure of an unencrypted data stream (e.g., on a circuit
board trace). This renders Summers completely different from the claimed
invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-44 is not shown or suggested by the cited combination within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims (Claims 1-44) are now in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 3/12/, 2004



Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060